

ALABAMA COMMISSION ON THE EVALUATION OF SERVICES

Meeting Minutes

evidence.alabama.gov

Date and Location

The Alabama Commission on the Evaluation of Services met on May 5th, 2021 at 12:02 p.m. in Alabama State House, 11 S. Union Street, Montgomery, AL, Room 325.

Attendance

Member	Present	Teleconference	Absent
Chairman Orr			
Vice-Chair Filmore			
Commissioner Albritton			
Commissioner Carlton			
Commissioner Coleman- Madison			
Commissioner Green			\boxtimes
Commissioner Sawyer			
Commissioner Scott			
Commissioner Story		\boxtimes	
Commissioner White			
Commissioner Whitt			
Commissioner Wingo			
Commissioner Butler, ex officio (Finance Director)			
Commissioner Fulford, ex officio (LSA Fiscal Division Deputy Director)			

A lawful quorum of voting members is present to conduct business.



Notice of Meeting:

Sufficient notice of the meeting was posted on April 12, 2021 to the Secretary of State's Open Meeting Act Posting Board.

Approval of Minutes:

Approval of the minutes of the previous meeting on February 9, 2021.

A motion was made by Commissioner Scott to adopt the minutes as written. Commissioner Albritton seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously with all those present voting.

Old Business:

None

New Business:

Opening remarks were made by Director Marcus Morgan including introduction of representatives in attendance from the Department of Corrections (DOC), Alabama Community College System (ACCS), and provider community colleges.

A brief explanation of the Service Assessment – Correctional Education was provided clarifying the intent to understand the subject matter and provide potential areas for further evaluation in the future.

Amber Bullock delivered a presentation on the Service Assessment - Correctional Education.

Following the presentation, Q&A as well as open discussion as follows:

- Clarification on the lack of performance metrics. With the understanding that there were no common
 performance outcomes across providers in terms of recidivism, employability, etc. Ms. Bullock's response
 confirmed the understanding but pointed to the shared goals.
- Discussion on the fact that the state did look at recidivism rates but wanted further clarification on the
 evaluations statement that the state did not know how it was progressing as it related to offenders
 participating in Career Technical Education (CTE). Ms. Bullock's response noted a lack of data necessary to
 produce recidivism or employment performance metrics for those offenders who had participated in CTE
 programming. Follow-up by the member asked who should be tasked with this responsibility and who
 oversees the data collection infrastructure.
- The Chairman offered Pardons and Paroles (P&P) role in tying post-release employment to education received during incarceration. A representative from the DOC that P&P would be involved in about 3/4 of the cases.
- Discussion continued on the infrastructure necessary to use information from multiple systems to measure
 employment performance metrics, confirming that there is no offender requirement to report employment.
 Questioned what could be done to ramp up the data sharing and tracking. Ms. Bullock responded with
 increase encouragement of interagency agreements and cooperation, specifically with the Department of
 Labor (DOL), Department of Commerce, and DOC.
- Question was posed by a member regarding a model state that may have a replicable data sharing
 agreement(s). Ms. Bullock offered New York's Department of Corrections and noted some of Georgia's
 infrastructure was replicable. In response, the member suggested that in adopting models from other states
 and subject areas, it is helpful to recognize the geographic similarities and how the areas infrastructure may
 overlap with Alabama's.



- Question offered by a member regarding companies seeking to hire previously incarcerated individuals and
 an evaluation of those individuals versus companies that are recruited or incentivized to hire ex-offenders. A
 representative from J.F. Ingram State Technical College responded that there wasn't any encouragement from
 the state to incentivize companies to hire ex-offenders, noting that there were federal incentives. The
 response continued to inform the need to exchange data and track employment. A recommendation regarding
 legislation to incentivize businesses to hire ex-offenders was made.
- Member suggested that further study should consider the impact of self-selection: if an inmate's propensity to
 earn education and improve their standing or status could be reflective of decreased recidivism regardless of
 if they received education or not.

Follow-up from previous report:

<u>Criminal Justice Best Practices</u> – Assistant Director Dean provided an update noting leaders in this field have data sharing and reporting agreements that strengthen the programs to make quick policy decisions. Leaders include New Jersey, Oregon, and Washington. Leaders responding to shift in correctional populations include Oregon and Georgia.

<u>Utilization of work product and action items</u> – members of the Commission have stressed the need to determine how to utilize the work product before proceeding to another policy area. Members commented on the number of evaluations that produced recommendations which the Commission should act. Member also referenced the joint leadership of the Commission and having members from two branches of government would have the ability to look at policies that would put recommendations into effect, noting the ownership of making something happen between both branches. Member asked the Chairman if it was his understanding or if it was the expectation of the commission to take a leadership role in formalizing action plans or recommendations to legislative or executive leadership.

The Chairman stated that the newly formed Commission is finding its way as it develops. He noted that the Commission cannot determine what either branch does but does have the ability to influence change. The Chairman sees the role as sharing the commission's recommendations, not forcing recommendations, but creating the path forward for recommendations. The Chairman asked the Vice Chair on her understanding of the Commission's role. The Vice Chair agreed with the Chairman and commented on navigating new waters of bringing forward new recommendations with an intent to make positive and collaborative impact.

The Chairman followed up by saying some work may be subtle, like opening up the lines of communication.

Director Morgan provided additional updates on the Suicide Prevention Evaluation and the Department of Mental Health's decision to be the lead agency to coordinate the state's efforts in suicide prevention. Mr. Morgan recommended taking up action items in a separate meeting to develop the mechanisms for evaluation recommendations and help construct the FY22 work plan.

Announcements (Marcus Morgan):

 Introduced the continued partnership with the Results First Initiative and brining educational resources to state agencies with the purpose of promoting continuous improvement. Educational opportunities can start to address the lack of data, siloed operations, and the infrastructure needed to evaluate internally. The Commission staff is continuing to pursue research partnerships from within the state as well as around the country. Bringing in experts to assist in implementation, data collections, and impact evaluations.



After the announcements, other members expressed their agreement with remarks regarding the utilization of work product and shared concerns about the Commission's approach to next steps as well. The Chair stated that he heard the concerns and agrees noting some recommendations would require bills and some would take executive action.

Adjournment:

There being no further business, at 12.54 p.m. Chairman Orr moved that the meeting be adjourned.